



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

into controversy with us, though we do think it was rather unpardonable carelessness to say *Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople*, when he meant *Timothy, of Laodicea*. We can assure Dr. G. that we were utterly innocent of any such intention. Our October number was published many days before we had the slightest idea that Dr. G. wished to retract anything he had written. Nor have we been able to find, after a diligent search amongst our multitudinous papers, any trace whatever of an intimation that he wished to correct his error, as stated in his letter to Mr. Collette. We are quite sure, and assert it on the good faith of a gentleman, that we never read such a letter from Dr. G.; nor do we believe we ever received any such prior to the 25th October, six days after the October number was published, when, in requesting us to make a correction in his version of "St. Basil's letter to Damasus," before putting it into type (which we readily did, and Dr. G. subsequently acknowledged and thanked us for), he complained that we had not allowed him to correct his error about Flavian in No. XXV. If he did so complain, we either never received his letter, or must have mislaid it without reading it, which is perfectly possible, as we never undertake to notice any letters which reach us after the first of the month in which we publish. We hope this will, at least, satisfy Dr. G. that we did not intentionally act unhandsonably by even an opponent who has not treated us with any unusual courtesy even in this very matter.

To show, however, further, that we had no reason for suppressing his correction, had we received it, we may say that the fact, which he states he wished to substitute, is quite as unsatisfactory as the supposed deposition of *Flavian*. The ecclesiastical historian, Dupin, in his life of Damasus (vol. i. Ecc. Hist., p. 227, Dub. Ed.), thus refers to it—"The Bishops of the East having desired Damasus to condemn Timothy, a disciple of Apollinarius, received this answer, that he was condemned long ago by a Council at Rome, in the presence of *Peter of Alexandria*. This letter is recited by Theodoret in ch. 10 of the 5th book of his History, and was written about the year 378."

We have also looked into Theodoret, and find that what he says is, that he condemned Timothy and his doctrines; but that as to deposing him it was needless, for he and Apollinarius had been deposed already.

The truth was that Damasus, notwithstanding his supposed infallibility, was at first deceived by Vitalis, the disciple of Apollinarius, one of the rival Bishops of Antioch (of whom we have before spoken, p. 27, supra), and believing from a confession of faith about the incarnation which he had given him, that he was orthodox, he had received him into communion. But Vitalis and his followers having subsequently refused to sign certain articles about the Trinity and the Incarnation, "Damasus," says Gregory Nazianzen, "understanding this, cast them out of the Church, and tore the libel and anathematisms which had been presented him by Vitalis, being much troubled that he had been so deceived. He gave this judgment in a Council at Rome, held in the year 377, at which *Peter, Bishop of Alexandria*, assisted. The Bishops of the East approved of what Damasus had done, and confirmed the judgment which the Pope had given against the Apollinarians; for in the Synod of Antioch, in the year 378, they signed a tome or writing of the Western Bishops, which condemned their errors."

One more word, and we have done. Dr. Geraghty, in the same letter, accuses us of having suppressed certain of his references, in proof of his extracts Nos. XIV. and XV., page 117.

This we wholly deny. All the passages and references he gave were accurately printed as he gave them. The references were—"Apud Athanasius, Apol. 2, contra Arian tom. i., p. 153. Theodoret Hist. lib. 2, c. 3; yet, in writing to Mr. Collette, he says the Editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN suppressed his reference to St. Athanasius, which he says was St. Athanasius, in Apolog. adversus Arianos, p. 148, E. t. i., Ed. 1698, and was not fool enough to let his readers know what Athanasius and Theodoret say about the citation of Athanasius. If our readers do not know it, it is not our fault, but Dr. G.'s; for we have fortunately preserved his original MS., in which there are no other references given than those actually appearing in our print. The word *libid* being the only word omitted, and that through mere inadvertence of the printer. We suppressed nothing, but truly cited Sozomen, Socrates, and Dupin (supra p. 118) to show that Athanasius fled to Rome for protection, out of fear of the violence of his enemies. His calumniators (the Eusebians) may have been cited, but they refused to submit to Pope Julius's jurisdiction, though they had previously offered him the arbitration of their differences with Athanasius. In all this we see not a word to retract, nor has Dr. Geraghty impugned, much less disproved, the accuracy of one of our authorities in this matter. If either Pope Julius's letter, as given in Athanasius's works, or Theodoret assert the contrary, it proves nothing. The Eusebians, supposing they were cited, would not come. If Julius boasts like Glendower—

"I can call spirits from the vasty deep!"

We answer with Hotspur—

"Why, so can I, or so can any man."

But will they come when you do call for them?"

—1 Hen. IV.  
As to Athanasius, whether formally cited or not, that he appeared *right willingly* there can be no doubt whatever, as Pope Julius was most favourable to him from the first, and he had no other chance of escaping from the unjust treatment he had received from the Arian party in the East. We have already shown how indignantly the letter of Pope Julius was received by the Council at Antioch, and how decidedly they threatened hostility unless he (Julius) sanctioned the deposition of the Bishops they had expelled, and the ordination of those whom they had elected in their stead!

What reason had we, then, to fear to let our readers know anything said by Julius in this letter, or to suppress the

passage from Theodoret, which we gave the accurate reference to, even as furnished by Dr. Geraghty in his letter to Mr. Collette? Again we say with Hotspur,

"And I can teach thee, coz, to shame the devil,  
By telling truth; tell truth, and shame the devil."

We have now done, and think even Dr. Geraghty himself ought to feel that he is fairly vanquished by an *honourable* opponent, who is quite above the low arts he recklessly accuses him of. But whether he thinks so or not, we must now, and we are happy to be able to do so in perfect good humour, bid him finally, Farewell.

#### LORENZO BENONI.

We have just stumbled upon the book referred to in page 137, supra, and think the following extract worth insertion. The writer was an Italian, a native of Genoa, in which city he was educated and resided at the period.

Having received a mysterious letter, desiring him to be next morning, at twelve o'clock, at the Loggia of Banchi, in the covered Exchange of Genoa, on the side facing Via degli Orefici, Goldsmith's-street, the writer says—

"Accordingly, a little before twelve o'clock, I was in the Loggia of Banchi, walking up and down the side that faces Via degli Orefici.

"During this perambulation I was struck with surprise at the great number of priests assembled in this spot, some standing in groups, some sitting on chairs and benches, some walking up and down, as I myself was doing. One of these last, after having eyed me attentively, muttered, as he passed, some words evidently addressed to me, but the meaning of which I could not catch. Could he be my man? Under this impression, I managed to pass very near him on my first turn, when he again spoke to me. This time I did not lose a word of what he said. 'Any Masses, sir? very cheap.' I could make nothing of it; and he, no doubt, seeing as much by the blank hesitation of my countenance, turned and walked away. It was not till some time afterwards, that by inquiry and personal observation, I came to learn the meaning of this priest's words, and the motive which brought so many of his brethren to that place. While Lazzarino keeps us waiting, I may as well impart to the reader my information on the subject.

"There is scarcely any man so destitute as to die without leaving something to pay for a certain number of Masses for the benefit of his soul, or hardly any poor woman who has not, from time to time, some Masses performed, either for the soul of a deceased relative, for the cure of some sick member of her family, or for some such object. The sale of Masses, therefore, is very considerable in Italy. I purposely say the *sale*, for the Mass is paid for, and forms an essential part of a priest's income. The price varies according to the demand, exactly like the price of stocks, and, like them, Masses rise or fall with the greater or less supply in the market.

"The spot where this singular exchange was held, where the price of Masses was regulated, and all transactions relative to this odd species of merchandise took place, was precisely the Loggia of Banchi, on the side facing Goldsmith's-street.

"If it was your wish to have a Mass said immediately, or if you had an investment of five hundred Masses to make, you could find what you wanted in this place. Brokers (priests of course) came to meet you and made the bargain. Suppose a priest, who had some hundreds of Masses to say, to be in want of ready money, he found there these said brokers, who took the Masses at a discount, and paid him the difference. Some of the big-wigs—Rothschilds of this Exchange—had in their pocket-books thousands and thousands of Masses. These men monopolised the ware at a good price, and then got rid of it at a profit to poor priests, their clients (especially to those from the country), and thus realised considerable gains.

"This sale of Masses sometimes gave rise to very ludicrous scenes. I have frequented the place often enough to witness a great variety of such. I shall merely note the following—

"A livery-servant, sent by his master, from Albaro, a large village at a few miles' distance, was bargaining with a priest for a Mass to be celebrated at the said place. The servant had been authorised to bid as much as three francs; but it was Sunday, the weather was bad, and there were but few priests at leisure. The merchandise was looking up.

"I won't stir for less than five francs," says the priest, turning away as if to break off the conference.

"Five francs! That is unconscionable," returned the servant; "why, one might get a *Norena* for that!"

"Well, then, get your *Norena*, but you shall not have a Mass."

"The priest crossed the street, and entered a liquor shop.

"Boy, a glass of brandy!" said he to the lad behind the counter.

"The servant, who followed close at the priest's heels, turned pale. If the priest should break his fast, farewell to all hope of a Mass.

"I'll give four francs, though I am sure I shall be scolded."

"Five francs! that's my first and last word," raising the glass to his lips; "you may take it or leave it as you please."

"He was just on the point of swallowing the contents, when the servant stopped his hand, saying,

"You drive a very hard bargain; however, you shall have the five francs; and so it was settled."—p. 361-4.

#### DISPENSATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Your facetious correspondent, "A. H.," states that a schoolmistress in Paris "bought a dispensation for herself and everybody in the house to eat butcher's meat four days in the week, instead of three," during Lent. This, sir, is a common custom in France. The ordi-

\* A religious service performed nine days running; as saleable an article as the Mass.

nances of Lent in that country—at least in some of the dioceses—are much more rigorous than in any part of England, where each Bishop has the power of prescribing such regulations for fasting as he may think fit. For instance, in no part of England is a black fast enjoined; whereas it is in France. Perhaps the term "black fast" may not be understood by you: the meaning is, that no flesh meat of any kind whatever shall be eaten by the faithful during the forty days of Lent. To get over this difficulty "the faithful" apply to the curés of their several parishes, and give according to their means a sum of money to obtain a dispensation to eat flesh meat on several days in the week. I know an English gentleman who resided with his family in France, who was accustomed every year to put a napoleon into the hands of the curé for a dispensation for himself and family to eat flesh meat *à discretion* during Lent. This custom brings in a considerable revenue to the curés, therefore black Lents are not likely to be discontinued. It is a marvel that the practice should have ceased in England; perhaps the Reformation had something to do with it.

Mr. Bowyer, Dr. Wiseman's knight, has written to the *Times* to say that the Dundalk banquet given to the Cardinal was not on a fast day—it was only a day of abstinence; on which the editor pertinently observes, "Where's the difference?" Now, sir, let it be remarked that there is not one of those two hundred "holy men" who feasted with the Cardinal on that memorable occasion who, if a poor man confessed to him that he had flavoured his potatoes with a small piece of bacon on that Friday, would not tell him that he had committed a mortal sin, for which he must do penance. Thus the "holy confessor" may feast on "Potages, Poissons, Hors D'Œuvres, Jambon surprise, &c., &c.;" in fine, on all delicacies which the sea produces, and that culinary art can make delicious to the palate; but his poor penitent, who has only greased his potatoes, is told that he has committed a sin deserving of eternal punishment! Allow me, sir, to make another remark. The man who *steals* a beefsteak commits, by the laws of the holy Church, a venial sin; but should he *eat* a beefsteak on a Friday he commits a mortal one. Thus the laws of man overrule those of God.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,  
T. E.

#### WHERE IS THE BARRIER AT WHICH ST. PETER SITS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—One of our Scripture Readers the other day asked a shepherd whether he knew what he must do to get to heaven? "Oh!" said he, "I know that right well, and I'm sure of it, for I often heard the master say it too, and he knows well. If the candle keeps lighting till I pass the third barrier I'm all safe." (It appears they place a lighted candle in the hand of a dying man, and let it burn out after he is dead.) "What barrier?" said the Reader. "Where St. Peter sits," said the man. "Is that in heaven or purgatory?" said the Reader. This rather puzzled him, and another man and he argued the point whether Peter was in heaven or purgatory! The reader explained the gospel plan of salvation. Two days afterwards he saw the man again at a lodging house; shaking him warmly by the hand, he said, "Well, no one in the fair knows what I am. I was awake all last night thinking of what you said, and now for the love of God come in and tell me some more." Have you ever heard of this barrier and the candle before?

Yours, faithfully, R.H.O.

#### THE GLORIES OF MARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—In the September number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 99, you made the following statement: "If what we must call the deification of the Virgin Mary goes on as it has done, the next step will be that she will be exalted so high that men will cease to have confidence in her willingness to condescend to listen to them, and they will seek for intercessors with her, just as she has been sought as an intercessor with her Son."

Allow me to refer you to pp. 138-9 of "The Glories of Mary," and you will find that "the step" which you so acutely conceived has already been taken. This book, you are aware, is of high authority, and "cordially recommended to the faithful" by Cardinal Wiseman. It states, then, in the pages referred to, that "Father Suarez correctly remarks, that we beg the saints to be our intercessors with Mary because she is their Queen and Sovereign Lady. 'Amongst the saints,' he says, 'we do not make use of one to intercede with the other, as all (saints) are of the same order; but we do ask them to intercede with Mary, because she is their Sovereign Queen.' And this is precisely what Saint Bernard promised to Saint Frances of Rome, as we read in Father Marchese; for he appeared to her, and taking her under his protection, he promised that he would be her advocate with the Divine Mother."

Whilst I acquit you, sir, of any ambition to be numbered "among the prophets," permit me to applaud your deep penetration.

Yours, &c.,

E. M. H.

<sup>b</sup> See Dupin's Eccl. Hist., vol. i., title, The Apollinarii, p. 215, also, Life of Damasus, already quoted, p. 227, where it is stated that the charges were signed by Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, Paeisius of Laodicea, Eulogius of Edessa, and other Easterns.